

MD 04/05/04  
Attorney Docket No: P0539D

Serial No: 09/747,735

## **REMARKS**

### **Introductory remarks**

Applicant appreciates Examiner's recognition of patentable subject material in claims 2, 9-11, 17, 19-21, and 24. The Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As will be seen further below, Applicant has incorporated this suggestion of the Examiner, to rewrite these allowable claims in independent form, without any change in claim scope.

### **Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-27 were pending in the application (27 total claims), of which claims 1, 18, and 22 were in independent form. Claims 1-27 are hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the same claims in a related application.

Claims 28-52 are hereby added (25 total claims), with claims 28, 43, 46, and 48 being in independent form. All newly added claims are supported throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

### **Rejections of the claims**

Claims 1, 3-8, 14, 16, 18, 22, 25, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirai et al. 6160526. These claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby mooting this rejection. As noted previously, Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in a related application.

Claims 12, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hirai in view of JP 11259620A. These claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby mooting this rejection. As noted previously, Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in a related application.

### **Rewriting of allowable subject matter**

The Examiner indicated that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of base claim (claim 1) and any intervening claims (none). Newly added claim 1 thus, corresponds to claim 2 rewritten in independent form, but without the first adhesive

MD 04/05/04  
Attorney Docket No: P0539D

Serial No: 09/747,735

layer originally recited in claim 1. Applicant does not believe that deleting the first adhesive layer requires a new search by the Examiner. Further, the Examiner himself appear to have noted (in his rejection of claim 1), that "adhesive layers used between structural layers of circuit cards are old and well known." Applicant maintains, therefore, that the first adhesive layer is not required in this embodiment of the invention and that claim 28 should be allowable as written.

Because 28 is allowable, all claims depending therefrom should be allowable (namely, claims 29-42) should likewise be allowable. For example, newly added claim 29 is substantially the same as original claim 15 (and thus already searched), but depends now from an allowable claim 28.

Newly added claim 30 also should be allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Claim 30 is supported throughout the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed and is at least supported at page 9, lines 25-28 of Applicant's Specification.

Newly added claim 31 includes subject matter of originally filed claims 5 and 6, thus requiring no new searching, but now depending from allowable claim 28. Claim 31 should thus be allowable.

Claim 32 includes subject matter of originally filed claims 3, 4, and 14, thus requiring no new searching, but now depends from allowable claim 28. Claim 32 should thus be allowable.

Claim 33 includes subject matter of originally filed claim 12, thus requiring no new searching, but now depends from allowable claim 28. Claim 33 should thus be allowable.

Claim 34 includes subject matter of originally filed claim 25, thus requiring no new searching, and ultimately depends from an allowable base claim (28). Claim 24 should thus be allowable.

Claim 35 includes subject matter included in originally filed claim 7, thus requiring no new searching, and ultimately depends from allowable base claim 28. Claim 25 should thus be allowable.

Claim 36 includes subject matter included in originally filed claims 7 and 8, thus requiring no new searching, and ultimately depends from allowable base claim 28. Claim 36 should thus be allowable.

Claims 37-40 correspond, respectively, to originally filed claims 9-11 and 17, respectively. Original claims 9-11 and 17 were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form. These claims now depend from allowable base claim 28 and thus should be allowable.

MD 04/05/04  
Attorney Docket No: P0539D

Serial No: 09/747,735

Claim 41 includes the subject matter of originally filed claims 16, plus the adhesive of originally filed claim 1, while depending from allowable claim 28. Thus, no new search is needed, and claim 41 should be allowable.

Claim 42 ultimately depends from allowable base claim 28 and thus should be allowable. The subject matter of claim 42 is supported throughout the specification, claims, and drawings as filed, including at least at page 4, lines 15-32.

Claim 43 corresponds to allowable claim 19 rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner and thus should be allowable.. Because claim 43 is allowable, all claims dependent therefrom (namely, claims 44 and 45) should likewise be allowable.

Claim 44 corresponds to allowable claim 20 but is modified to depend from allowable claim 42. No new search is required, and claim 44 should be allowable as containing subject matter of two different allowable claims, as well as depending from an allowable base claim (43).

Claim 45 corresponds to allowable claim 21 but is modified to depend from allowable claim 42. No new search is required, and claim 45 should be allowable as containing subject matter of two different allowable claims, as well as depending from an allowable base claim (43).

Claim 46 corresponds to allowable claim 20 rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner and thus should be allowable. Because claim 46 is allowable, all claims dependent therefrom (namely, claim 47) should likewise be allowable.

Claim 47 corresponds to allowable claim 21, but is modified to depend from allowable claim 46 (and thus effectively includes all limitations of base claim) and thus also should be allowable. No new search is required.

Claim 48 corresponds to allowable claim 24 rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, and thus should be allowable. Claims 49, 50, 51, and 52 correspond to original claims 23, 25, 26, and 27, respectively, and should be allowable as depending from an allowable base claim (claim 48).

All of the amendments to the claims and the additional claims are supported throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Where claims were rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, no narrowing of scope was intended or accomplished in any claim so rewritten.

MD 04/05/04  
Attorney Docket No: P0539D

Serial No: 09/747,735

Closing Remarks

A fee for excess claims of \$126.00 was paid with the previous Office Action Response, which covered 7 excess (dependent) claims in excess of the original filing fee. With this Amendment and Response accompanying RCE, the 27 pending claims are now cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, but 25 new claims are added, including five excess claims. In the instant Office Action, the excess claims include:

5 excess claims (5 times \$18/claim)	=	\$90
1 excess independent claim	=	\$86
Total Excess Claims Fees	=	\$176
Less Excess Claims Fees paid	=	- \$126
Total Excess Claim Fees due	=	\$50

Thus, a fee for excess claims of \$50.00 is thus believed to be due. In addition, this Amendment and Response accompanying RCE is being faxed to the USPTO Central Fax Number on April 5, 2004. Thus, Applicant hereby petitions for a one month extension of time (\$110.00). Please charge the RCE fee of \$770, extension of time fee and the fee for excess claims (total of \$930.00) to PTO Deposit Account No. 50-2535. An RCE Request and Transmittal detailing this information is enclosed.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and are in a condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and an early notice of allowance are hereby respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 781-744-6404.

Date: April 5, 2004


Digimarc Corporation  
19801 SW 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Suite 250  
Tualatin, OR 97062

Telephone: 781-744-6404  
FAX: 503-885-9880  
Alternate FAX: 781-744-6741

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By



Marianne McLaughlin Downing  
Registration No. 42,870